

**POLLUTION PREVENTION SUBGROUP TELECONFERENCE
FLASH MINUTES**

July 1, 1998

ATTENDEES

Beth Berglund*	Sam Clowney*	Linda Coerr	Jan Connery
John deRuyter*	Lachmann Dev*	Mark Devine	Chuck Feerick*
Alex Johnson*	Mark Kataoka	Fred Porter*	John Shoaff*
Heather Wright			

*Pollution Prevention Subgroup members

DISCUSSIONS AND DECISIONS

- The purpose of the teleconference was to discuss the revised alternative compliance provisions document. John deRuyter explained that much of the revision focused on splitting out and rearranging the topic headings. Clarifying text was also added to address questions and concerns raised by Pollution Prevention (P2) Subgroup members at the recent Los Angeles meeting.
- Fred Porter suggested that the document be rearranged so that it is clear as to what information the P2 Subgroup is recommending be forwarded from the Coordinating Committee (CC) to EPA and what information they are recommending be forwarded from the CC to the source work groups. There are four sections that are oriented towards proposing alternative compliance within the Title V permitting process: Permitting Process; Compliance, Monitoring, and Recordkeeping; Aggregation of Sources; and Environmental Impact Evaluation. Mr. Porter suggested that the P2 Subgroup clarify that these recommendations pertain to the Title V permitting process and group them together.
- Teleconference participants discussed the range of flexibility that can be incorporated into a MACT standard. EPA stated that compliance with a MACT standard cannot be open-ended. EPA may only establish equivalent, alternative provisions. EPA cannot develop a certain numeric emissions standard and allow facilities to determine alternative methods to achieve the same environmental benefits. (Alex Johnson reminded the Subgroup that they must consider health effects as well.) Beth Berglund said that because the ICCR is so broad, it is difficult to determine several alternative provisions that would satisfy the variations in source types and that providing flexibility through the Title V permitting process is the most efficient way to allow sources to develop alternative techniques to achieve compliance.
- A question was raised as to whether EPA has drafted generic flexibility language in previous regulations. Fred Porter explained that Part 60 of the General Provisions

pertaining to NSPS (New Source Performance Standards) provides facilities with the opportunity to petition EPA if they want to demonstrate compliance through alternative means. But, this process has proven to be burdensome and most facilities do not take advantage of it.

- Alex Johnson suggested that source categories be defined by the work groups before they make final determinations concerning flexibility and alternative compliance. Beth Berglund suggested that the P2 Subgroup draft language giving the source work groups some direction on defining the source categories. Mr. Johnson also stated that he has spoken with Jane Williams (who was unable to make the call) and she has concerns about the aggregation of sources.
- Alex Johnson also suggested that an equity issue exists and should be resolved by the P2 Subgroup. For example, facilities that are already implementing pollution prevention techniques may be at a disadvantage compared to those that have not implemented pollution prevention. Mr. Johnson offered to think about how these equity issues may be resolved and will draft language for inclusion in the document.
- Alex Johnson further suggested that, in the Permitting Process section, the acute measurement levels given as examples are not expressed in accurate terms or units. John deRuyter asked Mr. Johnson to develop alternative language concerning acute exposure and forward it to him.
- Chuck Feerick suggested that the P2 Subgroup draft instructions to the source work groups, because it is unclear at this point what they are to do with the information.

ACTION ITEMS

- Fred Porter will forward minor editorial changes to John deRuyter and Beth Berglund.
- Alex Johnson will draft language concerning equity issues and how to express acute measurements and forward it to John deRuyter and Beth Berglund.
- John deRuyter and Beth Berglund will revise the alternative compliance provisions document based on comments made during the call. They will bring hard copies of the revised document to the next meeting for review and discussion by the P2 Subgroup. They did not anticipate having a revised document to review prior to the next meeting.

NEXT MEETING

- The next meeting will be held on July 13 and 14 in Alexandria, VA. The Subgroup will meet for a full day on Monday the 13th and a half day on Tuesday the 14th (ends at 1 p.m.).